	U.S. DISTRICT COURT
IN THE UNIT	TED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FOR THE NO	RTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
	OT MODELL DIVICION
	APR 5 2004
KIM W. LUBKE	§
	S CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
V.	S CIVIL ACTION NO: 4:82-CV-0188-Y
CIMY OF ARTINGMON	S DEPUTY
CITY OF ARLINGTON	§
	VERDICT FORM
	e following questions based upon a
preponderance of the evide	ence as set out in Instruction No. 1.
Question No. 1.	
	e City of Arlington denied Kim Lubke's
	leave to care for his wife on the Y2K
	the FMLA as set out in Instruction No.
11?	
Answer: X	Yes No
Allswel:	_ ies NO
If you answer was as	to Question No. 1, above, then proceed
_	ise, skip to Question No. 3.
to Question No. 2, otherwi	ise, skip to Question No. 5.
Question No. 2.	
	money, if any, if now paid in cash for
	employment benefits that Kim Lubke was
	City's denial of Kim Lubke's rights to
leave under the FMLA	0101 5 dell-di 01 llam 2d8/10 5 119/105 00
\$ 281.00 fo	or wages and/or salary
\$ 113.00 fo	or wages and/or salary or employment benefits .
	- -
Question No. 3.	
	City of Arlington discharged Kim Lubke
	as set out in Instruction No. 12?
~/	
Answer: X	Yes No

Question No. 4.

State the amount of money, if any, if paid now in cash for any wages, salary, and/or **employment benefits** that would fairly and reasonably compensate Kim Lubke for the damages caused to him by reason of the City's discharge of him in violation of the FMLA.

Answer:

\$ \(\frac{286,000.00}{109,000.00} \) for wages and/or salary, and for **employment benefits**.

Question No. 5.

Having found that the City discharged Kim Lubke in violation of the FMLA, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the City would have discharged him anyway for other reasons entirely?

Answer: _____ Yes ______ No

Presiding Jurer